Natural Law Theory: A Philosophical and Theological Divide Between Believers in Objective Moral Order and Skeptics

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

October 3, 2024

Natural law theory asserts that universal moral principles exist, grounded in either human nature or a divine order, and are accessible through reason. These principles are often regarded as fundamental truths governing human behavior, transcending societal norms and legal systems. Historically, natural law has been embraced by both religious and secular thinkers, with religious proponents—especially within Christianity—viewing natural law as a reflection of God's eternal law. Conversely, secular defenders ground these principles in rationality and human flourishing without invoking a divine being. However, critics, including legal positivists, utilitarians, and existentialists, challenge the existence of an inherent moral order, whether divine or natural. They argue that morality is either a human construct, contingent on societal needs, or a product of individual freedom. This paper explores the philosophical and theological divide between proponents and skeptics of natural law theory, examining how belief in God or objective moral order informs one's stance, while also considering secular arguments for and against the theory.

Keywords: natural law theory, objective moral order, human nature, divine law, secular ethics, legal positivism, utilitarianism, existentialism, moral relativism, divine revelation, natural rights, human flourishing, rationality, theology. 41 pages.

I. Introduction

Context

Natural law theory is one of the oldest and most enduring ethical and legal philosophies, tracing its roots back to ancient civilizations and philosophical traditions. It holds that there are inherent, universal moral principles that govern human behavior, principles that can be discerned through reason and reflection on human nature or, in many cases, through divine revelation. These principles, advocates argue, are not contingent on social customs or legal systems but are timeless truths that exist independently of human institutions. They form the basis for discerning right from wrong, good from evil, and just from unjust laws.

The core idea behind natural law is that humans possess a shared nature that inclines them toward certain ends—such as the pursuit of life, knowledge, and social harmony—and that these ends are grounded in objective moral truths. In this view, certain actions (such as murder, theft, or lying) are wrong not merely because a society has declared them to be so, but because they violate fundamental aspects of what it means to be human.

Throughout history, proponents of natural law have often linked this moral order to a divine being or higher power. For example, Thomas Aquinas, perhaps the most well-known defender of natural law, asserted that natural law is a reflection of God's eternal law, imprinted on human reason. However, belief in God is not a necessary component for all defenders of natural law. Enlightenment thinkers like John Locke and modern philosophers such as John Finnis have framed natural law in secular terms, arguing that it is based on rational inquiry into human nature and flourishing.

Despite its long-standing influence, natural law theory has also faced substantial criticism. Its critics challenge the theory’s claim to universality, objectivity, and its reliance on human nature or divine authority as the basis for moral principles. Legal positivists, moral relativists, and utilitarians have all raised objections, arguing that moral principles are either socially constructed, vary across cultures, or should be based on the consequences of actions rather than any inherent moral order.

Thesis Statement

This paper seeks to explore the deep philosophical and theological divide between proponents and critics of natural law theory, with particular focus on whether belief in God or an objective moral order informs their perspectives. It will examine how natural law theorists, both religious and secular, defend their positions, arguing that morality is grounded in human nature or divine design. Simultaneously, it will explore the arguments posed by critics who challenge the very notion of universal moral laws, questioning whether such laws are genuinely discoverable through reason or religious faith.

While many natural law theorists anchor their views in theological principles, there are secular versions of the theory that appeal to reason and human nature without requiring belief in God. Conversely, many opponents, particularly atheists and moral relativists, reject the idea that morality is grounded in any universal or natural order. This suggests that the debate over natural law theory is not merely about law or morality in a vacuum but is tied to broader questions of metaphysics, the existence of God, and the nature of human reason.

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the correlation between belief in God and support for natural law, investigating how belief in a higher power or objective moral order influences one's stance on this age-old theory. The paper will explore the arguments of theistic natural law proponents who see morality as a reflection of divine will, alongside secular advocates who frame natural law in purely rational terms. It will also examine the critiques from various philosophical traditions, including legal positivism, utilitarianism, and existentialism, which challenge the idea that moral principles can be derived from nature or that they have any objective grounding.

Additionally, the paper will consider exceptions to the traditional correlation between religious belief and natural law advocacy. There are religious critics of natural law theory, particularly within some Protestant traditions, who argue that human reason is too flawed to discern moral truth apart from divine revelation. On the other hand, there are secular thinkers who support natural law on rational, humanistic grounds without appealing to God. These nuanced positions will be explored to provide a comprehensive understanding of the debate.

In doing so, this paper aims to shed light on the complexity of the natural law debate, highlighting how deeply it is intertwined with broader philosophical and theological issues. By understanding the reasons why some thinkers defend natural law and others reject it, we can better appreciate the enduring importance of this theory and the reasons for its continued relevance in discussions of morality, law, and human nature.

II. The Foundations of Natural Law Theory

Natural law theory has evolved through various philosophical traditions, originating in ancient Greece, maturing in Christian theology, and adapting to more secular forms in the Enlightenment. Its development reveals how deeply rooted this concept is in both religious and philosophical thought. Understanding its historical foundations provides essential context for the debates surrounding the theory today.

A. Historical Origins

1. Ancient Greek Philosophy: Stoicism and Aristotle's Ideas of Natural Justice and Rational Order

The roots of natural law theory can be traced back to ancient Greek philosophy, where ideas of justice, morality, and human nature were central to philosophical inquiry. The two most influential schools of thought in this period were Aristotelian philosophy and Stoicism, both of which laid the groundwork for later natural law theories.

- Aristotle: Aristotle (384–322 BCE) is one of the earliest philosophers to consider the relationship between human nature and justice. In his Nicomachean Ethics and Politics, Aristotle argued that justice is a form of natural order rooted in the essence of human beings. He believed that humans are rational creatures by nature, and that this rationality provides the foundation for determining right from wrong. Aristotle’s concept of natural justice (or "natural right") holds that some principles are universal and exist independently of human laws. According to Aristotle, these natural laws can be discovered through reason and are inherent in the very

fabric of the natural world, reflecting the purposes or "ends" (telos) that humans ought to pursue, such as well-being and flourishing.

- Stoicism: The Stoics, particularly Zeno of Citium (the founder of Stoicism) and later Roman Stoics like Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, expanded on this idea by asserting that there is a universal law—logos, or rational order—that governs the cosmos and is accessible to human reason. They argued that living in accordance with nature, or according to reason, is the key to virtue and moral living. For the Stoics, this natural law is universal and applies to all human beings, regardless of local customs or positive law (man-made law). The Stoic influence is critical because it emphasized the idea that human beings, through the use of reason, can discern a moral order that transcends societal norms and individual desires. This moral order, they believed, is rooted in the natural structure of the universe.

2. Roman Legal Thought: Cicero's Emphasis on Universal Natural Law

The Roman philosopher and statesman Cicero (106–43 BCE) played a pivotal role in integrating Stoic natural law into Roman legal and political thought. In his works, particularly De Legibus (On the Laws) and De Re Publica (On the Republic), Cicero developed a theory of universal natural law that applies to all people, at all times, and in all places.

Cicero believed that this natural law was superior to human laws and that any man-made law that contradicts natural law is unjust and illegitimate. He famously wrote, "True law is right reason in agreement with nature; it is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting." For Cicero, natural law provided the standard by which human laws should be measured. This concept deeply influenced later Western legal systems, particularly the development of jus naturale (natural law) in Roman jurisprudence, which would serve as the foundation for modern Western legal theory.

Cicero's work was crucial in transforming natural law from an abstract philosophical concept into a legal principle that shaped Roman law and, by extension, later European legal thought. His emphasis on justice being derived from nature rather than the will of rulers or legislatures became a key idea that echoed through the development of natural law theory in the Middle Ages and beyond.

B. Christian Influence on Natural Law

1. Thomas Aquinas: Synthesis of Aristotelian Philosophy with Christian Theology

The most significant contribution to the development of natural law in the Christian tradition comes from Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274). Aquinas built upon the foundations of Aristotle and Cicero, synthesizing their ideas with Christian theology to create a comprehensive framework for understanding natural law as part of God's eternal plan.

- Aquinas's Natural Law: In his seminal work, the Summa Theologica, Aquinas defines natural law as the part of God's eternal law that applies to human beings. He argues that God, as the creator of the universe, established an ordered and rational structure for the world, and that human beings, as rational creatures, are capable of discovering this order through reason. According to Aquinas, natural law is the participation of rational creatures in the eternal law of God. It is accessible to all people, regardless of whether they have received divine revelation, because it is embedded in human nature itself.

Aquinas further contends that the primary precepts of natural law—such as the preservation of life, reproduction, education of offspring, and living in society—are self-evident and universally recognized. These precepts are consistent with human nature and are aimed at human flourishing. However, secondary precepts of natural law, such as specific moral rules (e.g., prohibitions against theft or murder), require more detailed reasoning and may vary in interpretation across societies. Aquinas's synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian theology established natural law as a key component of Catholic moral teaching and deeply influenced subsequent legal and ethical theories.

- Natural Law and Divine Law: While Aquinas believed natural law was accessible through human reason, he also maintained that divine revelation, such as the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christ, provides additional guidance that clarifies and elevates natural law. This combination of natural law and divine law formed the basis for much of Catholic ethical thinking in the centuries to come.

C. Secular Approaches to Natural Law

1. The Development of Natural Law Theory by Enlightenment Thinkers

While natural law had a strong theistic foundation through figures like Aquinas, it underwent significant secularization during the Enlightenment. Thinkers of this era, like John Locke (1632–1704), took the core ideas of natural law but removed their explicit dependence on God, instead grounding them in human nature, rights, and reason.

- John Locke's Natural Rights: Locke, in his works such as Two Treatises of Government, argued that natural law gives rise to certain natural rights—specifically, the rights to life, liberty, and property. He believed that these rights were inherent in human beings by virtue of their nature and could be discovered through reason, independent of divine revelation. Locke's secular version of natural law became foundational for the development of modern democratic and legal systems, particularly in the formulation of natural rights theory. Locke's ideas profoundly influenced the political philosophies of the American and French revolutions, where the notion of inalienable rights found expression in documents like the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen.
- Enlightenment Secularization of Natural Law: Other Enlightenment figures, such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Immanuel Kant, also built on natural law, but, like Locke, they secularized it further. Rousseau focused on the concept of general will and the social contract, which replaced divine authority with the collective rationality of the people. Kant developed a moral philosophy based on reason alone, most notably his categorical imperative, which, though not explicitly labeled as natural law, reflects similar principles of universal moral duties derived from human rationality.

Secular natural law theory, especially in its modern forms, continues to shape human rights discourse and legal systems, even as it diverges from its religious origins. Thinkers like John Finnis have worked to reconcile secular natural law with human rights and practical reasoning, demonstrating that natural law, while historically linked to religion, retains significant influence in secular ethical thought.

This exploration of natural law's historical origins shows its evolution from philosophical reflections in ancient Greece, through its integration into Christian theology, to its secular transformation during the Enlightenment. Each of these developments demonstrates how the theory has adapted to changing worldviews while maintaining its core principles: that moral truths exist, are discoverable, and are grounded in either human nature or divine law.

III. The Theological Basis for Pro-Natural Law Theory

Natural law theory, in its classical form, is often grounded in theistic frameworks, where belief in God provides the foundation for the existence of universal moral principles. This section explores how various religious traditions articulate natural law in relation to divine authority, showing that these principles are often seen as a reflection of God's will or reason. These traditions offer different interpretations of how humans come to know and follow these laws, but they all share the common idea that morality is grounded in an objective order established by the divine.

A. Theistic Foundations

1. Aquinas and Christian Theology: How Belief in God Informs the Idea that Natural Law is a Reflection of Divine Reason

In the Christian tradition, Thomas Aquinas is the most influential figure in shaping natural law theory. Aquinas integrated the philosophical insights of Aristotle with Christian theology, crafting a vision of natural law that remains foundational to Catholic thought.

- Natural Law as Participation in Eternal Law: For Aquinas, the concept of natural law is rooted in his broader theological framework. He argues that God, as the creator of the universe, has established an ordered and rational structure for the world, known as the eternal law. This eternal law reflects God's reason and will, governing all creation. Humans, as rational beings made in the image of God, are capable of participating in this eternal law through the use of their reason. Aquinas writes in the Summa Theologica

that "the natural law is nothing other than the rational creature's participation in the eternal law."

Belief in God is central to this framework because natural law is not merely an abstract set of principles; it is a reflection of divine reason. Human beings, by virtue of their rationality, can discern the natural law through reason, but this law ultimately comes from God. Aquinas contends that humans have an inherent inclination toward the good, which reflects God's design for human flourishing. The basic precepts of natural law, such as the preservation of life, the education of offspring, and the pursuit of truth, are thus grounded in the purposes for which God created humanity.

- Moral Knowledge through Reason and Revelation: While natural law is accessible to all people through reason, Aquinas also emphasizes the importance of divine revelation. Revelation, such as the teachings of Scripture, clarifies and supplements the natural law, especially in cases where human reason might be clouded by sin or ignorance. For example, while natural law might lead a person to understand that murder is wrong, divine revelation explicitly articulates moral commandments in more detail, such as the Ten Commandments. Thus, for Aquinas and Christian natural law theorists, reason and revelation work in harmony to guide moral understanding, both pointing to the same divine source of law.
- Human Flourishing as a Divine End: Aquinas also ties natural law to the concept of human flourishing or eudaimonia, which is the ultimate purpose for which humans were created. This idea, inherited from Aristotle, is given a theological dimension in Aquinas's thought. He argues that human beings were created with certain natural inclinations, such as the desire for self-preservation, procreation, and the pursuit of truth, which correspond to divine purposes. Fulfilling these inclinations allows humans to achieve the happiness and flourishing intended by God. In this way, natural law is not just about obeying rules but about living in accordance with the purposes for which God made us, thereby aligning human life with the divine order.

2. Islamic Natural Law: Maqasid al-Sharia and Fitra, the Natural Disposition to Do Good

In Islamic thought, natural law is reflected in the concepts of fitra and Maqasid al-Sharia, both of which indicate that human beings have an innate moral compass and that Islamic law (Sharia) is designed to protect essential human interests.

- Fitra (Natural Disposition to Do Good): In Islam, fitra refers to the natural disposition with which every human being is born. According to Islamic teachings, humans are created with an innate sense of morality and a natural inclination to worship God and do good. The Quran states, "So set your face toward the religion, as a man of pure faith—God's original creation (fitra) upon which He fashioned mankind" (Quran 30:30). This concept of fitra suggests that humans, by their very nature, are inclined toward the moral truths embedded in the universe by God.

Fitra aligns closely with the idea of natural law because it posits that there are moral truths inherent in human nature, which can be discerned without the need for formal revelation. However, revelation through the Quran and the Hadith (sayings of the Prophet Muhammad) further guides humanity, ensuring that their natural inclinations align with the divine will. The fitra, then, serves as a form of natural law in Islam, emphasizing that humans are born with the capacity to know right from wrong, but that this capacity must be nurtured and protected by adhering to God's commands.

- Maqasid al-Sharia (Objectives of Islamic Law): Another significant Islamic concept that parallels natural law theory is the doctrine of Maqasid al-Sharia, or the objectives of Islamic law. This doctrine, developed by Islamic scholars such as Al-Ghazali and Ibn Ashur, identifies five primary goals that Sharia seeks to preserve: life, intellect, religion, family, and property. These objectives are understood as universal values that reflect the natural order and serve to protect human welfare.

The Maqasid are considered to be in harmony with human nature and the fitra because they safeguard the essential aspects of life that allow individuals to thrive. By protecting these fundamental values, Islamic law ensures that human beings can fulfill their natural purpose as created by God. In this way, Islamic thought mirrors natural law theory by asserting that there are universal moral

truths and objectives that guide human behavior, and that these truths are grounded in the divine will.

3. Jewish Thought: The Role of Maimonides and the Integration of Natural Law Principles within Judaism

While Judaism does not have a formalized theory of natural law as in Christianity or Islam, elements of natural law thinking can be found in the writings of Jewish philosophers, most notably Maimonides (Rabbi Moses ben Maimon).

- Maimonides and Rational Ethics: Maimonides (1138–1204) was deeply influenced by Aristotelian philosophy and sought to reconcile this with Jewish theology. In his works, such as The Guide for the Perplexed and Mishneh Torah, Maimonides argues that reason is a gift from God, and that through reason, humans can discern moral truths that are consistent with the divine order. He believed that God's commandments (mitzvot) are not arbitrary but are designed to promote human welfare and align with rational moral principles.

Maimonides maintained that some aspects of the Torah, such as prohibitions against murder and theft, are rationally self-evident and correspond to natural law principles. These laws, which can be discerned by any rational person, are not unique to Judaism but are part of the broader moral order established by God for all humanity. Maimonides wrote that the Noahide Laws, which apply to all humanity, reflect universal moral principles that can be known through reason and are thus akin to natural law.

- Natural Law and Divine Command: However, Maimonides also argued that other commandments, particularly those related to ritual observance, go beyond what reason can discover. These laws, he contended, are accessible only through divine revelation. Thus, in Maimonides's thought, there is a balance between natural law (rational ethics) and divine command. Some laws are naturally known to all people, while others are specific to the covenantal relationship between God and the Jewish people.

In this way, Maimonides integrates elements of natural law into Judaism by suggesting that the Torah's ethical teachings reflect universal principles that align

with human nature and reason, even as the Torah also contains divinely revealed laws that surpass human understanding.

In summary, the theological basis for pro-natural law theory is grounded in the belief that there is an objective moral order established by God and accessible to human reason. Whether through Aquinas's synthesis of Christian theology and Aristotelian philosophy, Islamic concepts of fitra and the Maqasid al-Sharia, or Maimonides's integration of rational ethics within Judaism, these religious traditions affirm that moral truths are embedded in the natural world and that humans, as rational and moral beings, are capable of discerning and following them. This alignment of natural law with divine reason underscores the belief that morality is not a human invention but a reflection of the deeper, ordered structure of the universe, created and sustained by God.

IV. Secular Defenses of Natural Law Theory

While natural law theory has deep roots in theistic traditions, it underwent significant secularization during the Enlightenment, where thinkers sought to ground the theory in human nature and reason, rather than divine command. This shift allowed natural law theory to remain influential in legal and moral philosophy, even in increasingly secular societies. Secular natural law theorists argue that moral principles can be discovered through reason and reflection on human nature, without the necessity of invoking God. In this section, we will explore the contributions of Enlightenment philosophers like John Locke and Immanuel Kant, as well as contemporary thinkers like John Finnis, who defend natural law theory without relying on religious foundations.

A. Enlightenment Secularization

1. John Locke and Natural Rights: Human Rights as Grounded in Human Nature, Independent of Belief in God

One of the most important figures in the secularization of natural law theory was John Locke (1632–1704). Locke's theory of natural rights, which became foundational for modern democratic and legal systems, is rooted in the idea that

certain moral principles are inherent in human nature and can be discovered through reason, rather than through divine revelation.

- Locke's Natural Law and Natural Rights: Locke developed his theory of natural law primarily in his Two Treatises of Government. He argued that by virtue of being human, individuals possess certain natural rights, including the rights to life, liberty, and property. Locke believed these rights were self-evident, meaning they did not depend on the laws of any particular government or the customs of any society. Instead, these rights were grounded in human nature itself, and any just government must recognize and protect them.

Although Locke was a Christian and did reference God in his writings, he framed natural rights in such a way that they could be understood as independent of religious belief. His reasoning was grounded in the nature of human beings as rational, autonomous agents who are capable of making choices and pursuing their own happiness. According to Locke, the role of government is to protect these natural rights, and any government that fails to do so can be legitimately overthrown. His work laid the groundwork for the development of modern human rights theory, which often invokes principles of natural law but does so without explicit reliance on religious doctrines.

- Impact on Political Philosophy: Locke's secularization of natural law profoundly influenced the political philosophy of the Enlightenment, as well as the founding of modern democratic states. The Declaration of Independence in the United States, for instance, draws directly on Locke's theory of natural rights, stating that "all men are created equal" and "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights." Even though this document mentions a Creator, the rights themselves are understood as inherent to human beings, independent of any particular religious belief system.

Locke's ideas also influenced the French Revolution and the development of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen, which asserted that all individuals possess natural rights that no government or monarch can violate. In both of these contexts, Locke's secularized natural law theory served as the

philosophical basis for claims about human dignity, equality, and justice, without needing to appeal to a religious framework.

2. Immanuel Kant's Categorical Imperative: Universal Moral Duties Derived from Reason, Echoing Natural Law Principles

While Locke grounded his theory of natural rights in human nature, Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) provided a more explicitly secular framework for understanding moral duties. Kant's moral philosophy, particularly his concept of the categorical imperative, echoes natural law principles by positing that there are universal moral laws that can be derived purely from reason.

- Kant's Moral Philosophy and the Categorical Imperative: In his works, such as the Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, Kant sought to develop a moral system based on autonomous human reason. He rejected the idea that morality could be derived from consequences (as in utilitarianism) or from external authorities, such as religious or governmental institutions. Instead, Kant argued that moral laws are grounded in reason itself, and that every rational being is capable of discerning these laws through rational reflection.

The core of Kant's ethical system is the categorical imperative, which can be formulated in various ways, but one of its most famous formulations is: "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law." This principle mirrors natural law theory by asserting that moral laws must be universal and applicable to all rational beings, regardless of their individual desires or social context. According to Kant, morality is not based on subjective preferences or contingent social norms, but on the inherent rationality of human beings, who are capable of acting according to principles that are universally binding.

- Secularization of Universal Moral Principles: Although Kant's ethical theory is not typically categorized as natural law, it shares important similarities with the natural law tradition. Like natural law theorists, Kant believed that morality is grounded in universal principles that are accessible to all rational beings. However, whereas natural law theorists might argue that these principles are derived from human nature or divine order, Kant argued that they are derived solely from the capacity for reason.

Kant's approach secularized the idea of universal moral laws, making them independent of any metaphysical or theological assumptions. This shift was important in the development of secular ethics, as it provided a robust framework for moral reasoning that did not rely on religious foundations. Kant's categorical imperative remains a central concept in contemporary moral philosophy, particularly in discussions about human dignity, autonomy, and universal human rights.

B. Contemporary Secular Natural Law Advocates

1. John Finnis: Natural Law Theory Defended Without Explicit Reliance on God, Through the Concept of Human Flourishing and Rational Inquiry

In the 20th century, John Finnis emerged as one of the most influential defenders of natural law theory in a largely secular academic environment. While Finnis is personally a Catholic, his formulation of natural law does not rely on explicit theological foundations. Instead, he presents natural law as a rational and objective framework for understanding human flourishing.

- Finnis's Theory of Natural Law: In his landmark work, Natural Law and Natural Rights, Finnis argues that natural law is grounded in the idea of human flourishing or well-being. He identifies a series of basic goods, such as life, knowledge, play, aesthetic experience, friendship, and practical reasonableness, which are intrinsic to human flourishing. These goods, according to Finnis, are self-evident and can be known through rational reflection on human nature and experience.

Finnis's version of natural law does not require belief in God or any metaphysical assumptions about the nature of the universe. Instead, he argues that these basic goods are universally valuable because they are essential to human well-being. By recognizing and pursuing these goods, individuals and societies can create moral frameworks that promote human flourishing. For Finnis, the role of law is to support and protect these basic goods, ensuring that individuals have the freedom and opportunity to pursue them.

- Practical Reason and Moral Objectivity: One of Finnis's most important contributions is his emphasis on practical reason as the means by which humans discern moral truths. He argues that human beings are capable of

using their reason to identify the basic goods and to develop principles for action that promote these goods. These principles are objective, meaning that they are not dependent on individual preferences or cultural norms, but are rooted in the nature of human flourishing.

Finnis's approach is a modern, secularized version of natural law that retains the key idea that there are objective moral principles grounded in human nature. However, he avoids explicit appeals to God or divine law, making his theory accessible to both religious and non-religious audiences. His work has had a significant influence on contemporary legal and moral philosophy, particularly in discussions about human rights, justice, and the role of law in promoting the common good.

- Influence on Human Rights Discourse: Finnis's secularized natural law theory has been particularly influential in the development of modern human rights discourse. By grounding human rights in the basic goods that are essential to human flourishing, Finnis provides a rational, objective foundation for the claim that all individuals possess certain inalienable rights. His theory has been used to defend the idea that human rights are not merely social constructs or legal fictions, but are grounded in the nature of human beings and their capacity for rational action and flourishing.

In summary, the secular defenses of natural law theory, from John Locke's theory of natural rights to Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative, demonstrate that the core ideas of natural law can be sustained without relying on religious foundations. These Enlightenment thinkers laid the groundwork for modern secular ethics by framing moral principles as inherent in human nature or derived from reason, rather than divine command. Contemporary theorists like John Finnis have further developed these ideas, showing that natural law can be defended through rational inquiry into human flourishing, providing a robust framework for understanding morality and human rights in a secular context. This secularization of natural law has allowed it to remain a powerful and influential theory in both legal and moral philosophy, even in an increasingly secular world.

V. The Philosophical Critique of Natural Law Theory

While natural law theory has been a foundational framework in ethical, legal, and political thought for centuries, it has faced significant critiques from various philosophical traditions. These critiques challenge the core claims of natural law, particularly its assertion of universal, objective moral principles grounded in human nature or divine reason. Legal positivists, moral relativists, utilitarians, and existentialists all offer arguments that question the universality, objectivity, and practical utility of natural law theory, emphasizing human constructs, cultural diversity, and individual freedom. This section will explore these critiques and the alternative frameworks they propose.

A. Legal Positivism and the Rejection of Moral Law

One of the most influential critiques of natural law theory comes from legal positivism, which challenges the connection between law and morality. Legal positivists argue that law is a human construct, created by human authorities, and that there is no necessary connection between law and moral principles, whether derived from nature or divine command.

1. H.L.A. Hart and the Separation of Law from Morality

The English legal philosopher H.L.A. Hart (1907–1992) is perhaps the most prominent defender of legal positivism and its critique of natural law. In his seminal work, The Concept of Law (1961), Hart argues that law and morality are conceptually distinct, and that the validity of a law depends not on its moral content but on its source—whether it has been created by a recognized authority following established procedures.

- Law as a Social Construct: Hart's legal positivism posits that law is a system of rules created by human beings to regulate behavior and maintain social order. These rules are not necessarily moral, nor do they derive their authority from any higher, natural or divine law. Instead, they derive their authority from the sovereign or legal institutions that create and enforce them. For Hart, the idea that law must reflect moral principles, as natural law theorists claim, is a category mistake. He famously critiqued earlier natural law theorists, such as John Austin, who conflated law with morality, arguing that the existence of law is one thing, and its morality is another.

- The "Minimum Content of Natural Law": While Hart was a critic of natural law theory, he acknowledged that any legal system must have some minimum moral content to function effectively. In particular, he argued that certain basic rules—such as prohibitions against murder, theft, and violence—are necessary for any society to maintain order. However, Hart's acknowledgment of this "minimum content" of natural law does not imply that law must be morally grounded. Instead, he saw these basic moral principles as practical necessities for the survival of any legal system, rather than universal truths inherent in human nature.
- Critique of Natural Law's Universality: Hart's most significant critique of natural law is its universalism—the idea that certain moral principles apply to all human beings, at all times, and in all places. For Hart, legal systems are contingent on the social and historical contexts in which they are created, and their validity comes from their adherence to established legal procedures, not from their correspondence to universal moral laws. He argued that it is possible for a legal system to be valid (according to its own rules) but unjust, and conversely, for just moral principles to be outside the scope of positive law.

Hart's work laid the foundation for modern legal positivism, which continues to challenge the idea that law must be inherently moral. Instead, positivists argue that laws are rules made by human beings, and their authority comes from their creation by legitimate authorities, not from any connection to natural law.

B. Moral Relativism

Another significant critique of natural law theory comes from moral relativism, which denies the existence of universal moral principles. Moral relativists argue that moral values and norms are socially and culturally constructed, and thus vary from one society or individual to another. This view stands in direct opposition to natural law's claim that moral principles are universal and can be derived from human nature.

1. Moral Principles as Culturally or Individually Constructed

Moral relativism challenges the universality of natural law by asserting that moral norms are not grounded in objective truths but are instead products of cultural,

social, or personal factors. According to this view, what is considered "right" or "wrong" can differ significantly between cultures, historical periods, and even individuals.

- Cultural Relativism: This version of moral relativism argues that moral values are shaped by cultural practices and beliefs. What is considered moral in one society may be considered immoral in another, and there is no objective way to determine which set of values is superior. For example, practices such as polygamy, capital punishment, or gender roles vary widely across cultures, and moral relativists argue that it is inappropriate to impose a single, universal standard of morality on all cultures. This critique of natural law emphasizes that moral norms are context-dependent and not the product of a universal human nature.
- Individual Relativism: Some moral relativists extend this argument further by asserting that morality is not only shaped by culture but also by individual preferences and experiences. According to this view, moral judgments are subjective and based on personal values rather than any external, objective standard. From this perspective, natural law's claim that moral principles are grounded in human nature is flawed because it assumes a fixed, universal human nature that does not account for individual variation.

2. Michel Foucault and Power Dynamics Shaping Moral Systems

The French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984) offers a postmodern critique of natural law through his analysis of power and morality. Foucault rejects the idea that moral systems are based on universal truths, arguing instead that morality is a product of power relations within societies.

- Power and Morality: In works like Discipline and Punish and The History of Sexuality, Foucault examines how institutions—such as the state, the church, and the medical establishment—create and enforce moral norms to maintain social order and control. He argues that what is considered "moral" or "immoral" is not the result of objective reasoning or natural law, but the result of power dynamics that privilege certain groups over others. For example, Foucault critiques the way in which sexuality, mental health, and criminal behavior have been regulated throughout history, showing

how moral norms have been constructed to serve the interests of those in power.

- Critique of Universalism: Foucault's critique of natural law is rooted in his rejection of universalism. He argues that natural law theorists assume a universal human nature that can be objectively known, but in reality, concepts like "human nature" are shaped by historical and cultural forces. For Foucault, moral systems are contingent, constantly changing, and shaped by historical conditions and power relations, rather than being reflections of an eternal, natural order.

C. Utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is a consequentialist ethical theory that directly challenges natural law's emphasis on inherent moral principles. Utilitarians argue that the morality of an action should be judged by its consequences, specifically by whether it maximizes overall happiness or utility. This approach contrasts with natural law's claim that certain actions are intrinsically right or wrong, regardless of their outcomes.

1. Jeremy Bentham and the Critique of Natural Rights as "Nonsense on Stilts"

Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832), one of the founding figures of utilitarianism, was a vocal critic of natural law, particularly its emphasis on natural rights. Bentham famously described natural rights as "nonsense on stilts," arguing that they are abstract and meaningless when disconnected from real-world consequences.

- Consequentialist Ethics: Bentham's utilitarianism is grounded in the principle of utility, which holds that the rightness or wrongness of an action depends solely on its tendency to produce pleasure or prevent pain. According to Bentham, moral principles should not be based on abstract notions of natural rights or duties, but on the outcomes of actions. In this framework, laws and moral rules should be designed to maximize overall happiness for the greatest number of people, rather than to reflect inherent moral truths.
- Critique of Natural Law's Inflexibility: Bentham's utilitarianism critiques natural law for being rigid and dogmatic. Natural law, with its emphasis on absolute moral principles, leaves little room for considering the

consequences of individual actions. For Bentham, this approach is impractical because it fails to account for the complexity of real-world situations, where the outcomes of actions often matter more than their intrinsic qualities.

D. Existentialism

Existentialism, particularly as developed by philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre, presents a radical critique of natural law by rejecting the idea that morality is based on any external or objective source, whether in nature, human reason, or God. Instead, existentialists argue that morality is created by individuals through acts of freedom and choice.

1. Jean-Paul Sartre and the Argument that Morality is Created Through Individual Freedom and Choice

For Jean-Paul Sartre (1905–1980), the central tenet of existentialism is the idea that "existence precedes essence." This means that human beings are not born with a predefined nature or purpose; instead, individuals create their own essence through their actions and choices.

- Freedom and Responsibility: Sartre argues that human beings are radically free, meaning that they are responsible for creating their own values and determining their own moral actions. Unlike natural law theorists, who believe that moral principles are inherent in human nature, Sartre contends that there is no pre-existing moral order. Each person must define their own values through authentic choice. This freedom, however, comes with the weight of responsibility: individuals cannot escape the responsibility for their actions by appealing to external authorities or universal moral principles.
- Critique of Natural Law's Determinism: Sartre's existentialism critiques natural law for being deterministic, in the sense that it assumes humans are bound by a pre-existing moral order. For Sartre, this view denies the radical freedom that defines human existence. He rejects the idea that humans have a fixed nature or that morality can be derived from natural principles. Instead, morality is an ongoing process of self-creation, shaped by individual choices rather than universal norms.

In summary, the philosophical critiques of natural law theory come from diverse perspectives, each challenging its core assumptions in different ways. Legal positivists like H.L.A. Hart reject the connection between law and morality, emphasizing that law is a human construct with no inherent moral content. Moral relativists, including thinkers like Michel Foucault, argue that moral systems are shaped by cultural and historical forces, rather than reflecting universal truths. Utilitarians like Jeremy Bentham focus on the consequences of actions, rejecting the inherent moral principles espoused by natural law. Finally, existentialists like Jean-Paul Sartre challenge the very notion of a fixed human nature, arguing that individuals create their own moral values through acts of freedom and choice. Together, these critiques highlight the ongoing debate over the nature of morality, law, and human nature in philosophical thought.

VI. The Theological Critique of Natural Law Theory

While natural law theory has been embraced and developed by many religious traditions, particularly within Catholicism, it has also faced significant theological critiques. Some theologians and religious traditions argue that human reason is insufficient for discerning moral truths, which can only be known through divine revelation. This critique is particularly strong within certain strands of Protestantism, where theologians like Karl Barth rejected natural law as an overreliance on human reason. Additionally, there is a broader debate within religious thought about the relationship between scriptural revelations and natural law, with different traditions offering divergent views on whether morality can be discerned naturally or must be received through divine command. This section will explore these theological critiques of natural law theory.

A. Protestant Critiques of Natural Law

One of the most prominent theological critiques of natural law comes from within Protestantism, particularly in the thought of theologians who emphasize the fallenness of human reason and the necessity of divine revelation for understanding moral truth. Karl Barth, one of the most influential Protestant theologians of the 20th century, was a vocal critic of natural law theory, which he

saw as an attempt to derive moral knowledge from human reason rather than from God's revealed will.

1. Karl Barth: Criticism of Natural Law from a Theological Perspective

Karl Barth (1886–1968) was a Swiss Reformed theologian who played a central role in the development of neo-orthodoxy, a theological movement that rejected liberal theology's optimism about human nature and reason. For Barth, natural law was problematic because it placed too much confidence in human reason's ability to discern moral truths without the need for direct divine revelation. Barth's critique of natural law is deeply connected to his broader theological understanding of the human condition and the nature of revelation.

- The Fall and the Limits of Human Reason: Barth argued that, due to the fall of humanity, human reason is fundamentally corrupted and cannot be relied upon to discover moral or spiritual truths. In his view, the fall has so profoundly damaged human nature that individuals are incapable of understanding God's will or moral order through natural means. Barth was skeptical of any system, like natural law theory, that suggested that humans could access objective moral truths through reason alone. He believed that the gap between God and humanity caused by sin is so great that only through God's grace and revelation can humans come to know what is truly right and just.
- Critique of Autonomy in Natural Law: Barth was particularly critical of the autonomy that natural law theory seemed to grant to human reason. For natural law theorists, moral principles can be discerned by anyone, regardless of religious faith, because these principles are embedded in human nature or the structure of the world itself. Barth rejected this notion, arguing that human beings are entirely dependent on God's revelation in Scripture for moral guidance. In his view, there is no natural moral order accessible to human reason; all moral knowledge comes from God's revealed word, primarily through the person of Jesus Christ and the teachings of the Bible.
- The Centrality of Revelation: For Barth, the only reliable source of moral knowledge is special revelation—the truths that God has revealed to humanity through Scripture. Barth believed that relying on human reason

to discern moral truths diminishes the authority of Scripture and leads to moral relativism or error. In contrast, he maintained that God's will is revealed clearly in the Bible, and that human beings must rely solely on this divine revelation for understanding how they ought to live.

Barth's critique of natural law was part of a broader Protestant skepticism about the role of human reason in matters of faith and morality. His rejection of natural law was influential in shaping many Protestant traditions, particularly those that emphasize the sovereignty of God and the inadequacy of human reason apart from divine revelation.

B. Scriptural Revelations vs. Natural Law

The theological debate over natural law also centers on the relationship between natural reasoning and divine revelation in understanding morality. Different religious traditions have developed distinct views on whether moral truths can be discerned naturally through human reason or whether they must be revealed by God. This section will explore the differences between Catholicism and Protestantism on this issue, as well as how some religious traditions emphasize revelation over natural law.

1. Catholicism and the Integration of Reason and Revelation

In Catholic theology, natural law has traditionally been understood as a way in which human beings, through the use of reason, can participate in God's eternal law. Thomas Aquinas, the most influential Catholic natural law theorist, argued that humans are capable of discerning certain moral truths by reflecting on their own nature and the world around them. This view holds that moral principles, such as the preservation of life, the pursuit of knowledge, and the importance of family, are self-evident and can be known by all people, regardless of their religious beliefs.

- Natural Law as Complementary to Divine Revelation: For Aquinas and Catholic tradition, natural law is not seen as opposed to divine revelation but rather as complementary to it. While natural law provides a basic understanding of morality accessible to all people, divine revelation (such as the teachings of Scripture and the Church) provides a fuller and clearer understanding of God's will. Aquinas argued that human reason can

discover general principles of right and wrong, but revelation is necessary to guide people in the application of these principles in specific situations, as well as to provide moral teachings that surpass human reason (such as the Beatitudes and the commandment to love one's enemies).

- Moral Knowledge Accessible to All: Catholic natural law theory emphasizes that moral knowledge is accessible to all human beings, regardless of whether they have access to the Bible or other forms of divine revelation. This universality is one of the key strengths of natural law in Catholic thought. It allows Catholics to engage in moral dialogue with non-Christians and those of other faiths, on the basis that all people share a common human nature and can arrive at shared moral principles through reason. In this sense, natural law is seen as a bridge between Christian theology and secular ethics.

2. Protestant Emphasis on Revelation Over Natural Law

In contrast to Catholicism, many Protestant traditions have historically been more skeptical of natural law, particularly because of their emphasis on the fallenness of human reason and the sufficiency of Scripture for moral knowledge. While some Protestants have accepted a limited role for natural law, others, especially those influenced by thinkers like Martin Luther and John Calvin, have stressed the importance of divine revelation over human reasoning in matters of morality.

- Martin Luther and the Limits of Human Reason: Martin Luther, the founder of the Protestant Reformation, was deeply suspicious of the idea that human reason could lead to moral or spiritual truth. For Luther, the human mind was so corrupted by sin that it could not be trusted to discern right from wrong apart from God's direct guidance in Scripture. He famously referred to human reason as a "whore," prone to error and deception. Luther believed that moral knowledge came from faith in God's word, not from rational reflection on nature or human experience.
- John Calvin and the Need for Scripture: John Calvin, another influential Protestant reformer, echoed Luther's skepticism about natural law. While Calvin acknowledged that human beings have a conscience and some sense of right and wrong, he believed that this natural knowledge of morality was severely limited and prone to distortion. Calvin argued that the only reliable

source of moral knowledge is Scripture, which provides a clear and authoritative account of God's will. Like Barth, Calvin believed that human reason, though capable of some moral insight, was ultimately insufficient for understanding the fullness of God's moral law.

3. Other Religious Traditions and the Primacy of Revelation

Beyond Protestantism, other religious traditions also emphasize the role of divine revelation in moral knowledge, sometimes in ways that challenge or reject the concept of natural law.

- Islamic Thought: In Islam, while there is recognition of fitra (the natural disposition toward good), Islamic morality is fundamentally grounded in Sharia, which is understood as the divinely revealed law of God. While humans are believed to have an innate sense of right and wrong, this is not seen as sufficient for fully understanding God's will. Instead, moral knowledge is primarily derived from the Quran and the Hadith (the sayings and actions of the Prophet Muhammad). This emphasis on revelation means that, in Islamic thought, reason plays a secondary role to divine command in matters of morality.
- Judaism: Similarly, in Judaism, while some Jewish philosophers (such as Maimonides) have engaged with natural law ideas, the primary source of moral knowledge is considered to be Torah—the revealed law of God. Jewish law (Halakhah) is seen as a reflection of God's covenant with the Jewish people, and while there are aspects of moral reasoning that align with natural law, the ultimate authority comes from the commands of God as revealed in Scripture.

In summary, the theological critiques of natural law theory focus on the limitations of human reason and the necessity of divine revelation for understanding moral truths. Karl Barth and other Protestant theologians challenge the idea that humans can discern moral principles through reason, arguing that morality is known only through God's revealed word. These critiques emphasize the fallenness of human nature and the dangers of relying on reason apart from faith. Additionally, the broader debate over the relationship between

natural law and scriptural revelation highlights key differences between religious traditions, with Catholicism embracing a complementary relationship between reason and revelation, while Protestantism and other traditions prioritize revelation as the primary source of moral knowledge.

VII. Belief in God and the Divide Over Natural Law

The divide over natural law theory often mirrors a deeper philosophical and theological split about the nature of morality and whether it is rooted in a divine order or can be understood purely through human reason. Proponents of natural law—particularly those with religious beliefs—frequently view it as part of a universal moral structure that reflects God's design for humanity. On the other hand, secular defenders of natural law seek to ground it in human nature and rational inquiry, without the need for divine authority. At the same time, atheistic and secular critics of natural law theory challenge the very existence of universal moral principles, often arguing that morality is a human construct rather than an inherent order in nature or the cosmos.

A. How Belief in God Correlates with Pro-Natural Law Theory

Among religious thinkers, belief in God is often seen as integral to the defense of natural law. For many, the idea that the universe is governed by a divine order, and that human beings, as part of that creation, have access to moral truths through reason, provides a powerful foundation for natural law theory. This section explores why belief in God is frequently correlated with support for natural law.

1. Natural Law as Part of God's Design

Many religious thinkers advocate for natural law because they see it as part of God's intentional design for creation. The concept of natural law presupposes that the world is ordered and purposeful, with certain moral truths that are embedded in the fabric of reality. These truths are believed to reflect the will of a Creator, and human beings, as rational creatures made in the image of God, are capable of discerning these truths through reason.

- Thomas Aquinas and Eternal Law: One of the most influential religious defenders of natural law, Thomas Aquinas, argued that natural law is part of the broader category of eternal law—the rational order by which God governs the universe. According to Aquinas, natural law is the participation of human beings in this eternal law, allowing them to discern right from wrong by reflecting on their nature and the purposes for which they were created. For Aquinas, natural law is an expression of divine reason, and human beings, through their rational capacities, can understand this moral order as part of their participation in God's creation.
- God's Law Written on the Heart: Many religious traditions, particularly within Christianity, embrace the idea that natural law reflects God's moral law written on the hearts of all people. This concept is drawn from biblical texts, such as the Apostle Paul's assertion in Romans 2:14-15 that even those who do not know the Mosaic law have a sense of right and wrong because "the requirements of the law are written on their hearts." This idea is central to the claim that natural law is accessible to all human beings, regardless of their religious beliefs, because it is grounded in the way God created human nature.
- Natural Law as a Bridge Between Faith and Reason: For many religious thinkers, natural law serves as a bridge between faith and reason. It allows for the defense of moral principles on the basis of human rationality while also affirming that these principles are part of a divinely created order. This is why natural law has historically been attractive to theologians and religious philosophers who seek to show that religious morality is not in conflict with human reason but is, in fact, compatible with it. The moral laws discernible through natural law are seen as a reflection of God's will, even though they can be known through reason alone.

2. Moral Objectivity and the Divine Source

Belief in God provides a strong basis for moral objectivity in natural law theory. For religious proponents of natural law, the existence of God guarantees that moral principles are not arbitrary or contingent on human preferences. Instead, they are grounded in the nature of God, who is seen as the ultimate source of all goodness and moral order.

- Immutable Moral Principles: Religious defenders of natural law often emphasize that moral principles are immutable because they are rooted in the eternal nature of God. These principles do not change over time or vary between cultures, but are the same for all human beings because they are part of God's eternal law. This belief in the universality and immutability of natural law is closely tied to the idea that God is unchanging and that moral truths, as expressions of divine reason, are likewise unchanging.
- Purpose and Teleology in Creation: Another key reason why belief in God correlates with support for natural law is the idea that the universe is teleological—that is, it has a purpose or end (telos) established by its Creator. For religious proponents of natural law, human beings are created with a specific purpose in mind, and moral principles can be discerned by understanding that purpose. Aquinas, for example, argued that humans are naturally inclined to pursue the basic goods—such as life, procreation, and knowledge—that align with their God-given nature. By fulfilling these purposes, humans live in accordance with the natural law and thereby fulfill their divinely ordained role in creation.

B. Secular Defenders of Natural Law

Although natural law theory has strong religious roots, there are secular philosophers who defend the theory without relying on belief in God. These thinkers argue that natural law can be grounded in human nature, rationality, and the objective structure of the world, without requiring divine authority. Secular defenders of natural law seek to provide a rational basis for moral principles that can be accepted by both religious and non-religious individuals.

1. Natural Law Grounded in Human Nature

Secular defenders of natural law often argue that moral principles can be derived from an understanding of human nature and the human condition. According to this view, morality is not imposed from outside, whether by divine command or human convention, but is instead a reflection of what it means to be human. By examining the essential characteristics of human beings, such as their capacity for reason, social cooperation, and the pursuit of well-being, secular theorists claim that objective moral principles can be discerned.

- John Locke and Natural Rights: One of the most influential secular defenders of natural law was John Locke, who developed a theory of natural rights grounded in human nature. Locke argued that all human beings, by virtue of being rational agents, have inherent rights to life, liberty, and property. These rights are not dependent on any particular government or religious system but are based on the natural condition of human beings as free and equal. Locke's theory of natural rights became the foundation for modern human rights discourse and demonstrated that natural law principles could be defended in a secular framework.
- Human Flourishing and Basic Goods: Another important secular approach to natural law comes from contemporary philosopher John Finnis, who argues that natural law is grounded in the basic goods that are essential to human flourishing. These goods, which include life, knowledge, play, friendship, and practical reasonableness, are seen as intrinsically valuable and can be known through rational reflection. For Finnis, natural law is not dependent on religious belief but is instead based on a rational understanding of what contributes to human well-being. His work shows that natural law can provide a secular foundation for ethics and law that is compatible with diverse worldviews.

2. Moral Objectivity Through Reason

Secular defenders of natural law argue that moral objectivity can be achieved through reason rather than divine revelation. They believe that human beings, as rational creatures, have the capacity to discover moral truths by reflecting on their nature and the world around them. This view maintains that there are objective moral principles that apply to all human beings, regardless of their beliefs, because they are grounded in the common features of human existence.

- Immanuel Kant and the Categorical Imperative: Although Immanuel Kant is not typically classified as a natural law theorist, his theory of the categorical imperative shares key elements with natural law. Kant argued that moral principles must be universalizable and based on reason, rather than contingent on particular circumstances or divine commands. His emphasis on rational moral duties reflects the natural law idea that morality can be discerned through human reason. Kant's work shows that it is possible to

defend objective moral principles without appealing to God, relying instead on the rational capacities shared by all human beings.

C. Atheistic and Secular Critiques

While some secular thinkers defend natural law, others reject it, arguing that there is no inherent moral order in the universe or in human nature. These atheistic and secular critics challenge the very foundation of natural law theory, claiming that morality is a human invention, shaped by culture, society, and individual preferences, rather than something that can be discovered through reason or rooted in nature.

1. The Rejection of an Inherent Moral Order

At the heart of atheistic and secular critiques of natural law is the rejection of the idea that there is a universal moral order embedded in nature or human reason. Critics argue that natural law theory relies on outdated metaphysical assumptions about the world having a fixed purpose or design. Instead, they contend that morality is a human social construct, developed through historical and cultural processes rather than discovered through reflection on nature.

- David Hume and the "Is-Ought" Problem: One of the most famous critiques of natural law comes from the Scottish philosopher David Hume, who argued that it is impossible to derive moral principles (what "ought" to be) from statements about the natural world (what "is"). Hume's is-ought problem challenges the natural law assumption that moral duties can be derived from the nature of human beings or the structure of the world. According to Hume, moral values are not objective facts about the world but are based on human emotions and social conventions. This critique undermines the natural law claim that morality is grounded in an inherent order that can be known through reason.
- Friedrich Nietzsche and the Critique of Objective Morality: Friedrich Nietzsche, another prominent critic of natural law, rejected the idea of objective moral values altogether. Nietzsche argued that morality is a product of power dynamics and social conditioning, rather than an expression of a universal natural order. He famously critiqued traditional morality as a form of "slave morality" that suppresses individual freedom

and creativity. For Nietzsche, there is no inherent moral order in the world, and individuals must create their own values through acts of will and self-overcoming. His critique represents a radical challenge to natural law theory, denying not only its religious foundation but also the possibility of any objective moral truths.

2. Moral Relativism and Cultural Constructivism

Many atheistic and secular critics of natural law adopt a moral relativist position, arguing that moral norms are contingent on cultural and historical circumstances rather than being universally applicable. According to this view, different societies develop different moral systems based on their specific needs, beliefs, and power structures, and there is no single moral standard that applies to all human beings.

- Michel Foucault and Power Relations: The French philosopher Michel Foucault critiqued the idea that moral norms are grounded in nature or reason, arguing instead that they are the result of power relations within society. Foucault's work on the history of discipline and punishment, as well as his analysis of sexuality, showed how moral norms have been shaped by institutions like the state, the church, and the medical establishment. For Foucault, morality is not a reflection of an inherent natural law but a product of historical forces that seek to control and regulate human behavior. His critique challenges the idea that moral principles are timeless or universal, emphasizing their contingent and constructed nature.

In summary, belief in God is strongly correlated with support for natural law theory because religious thinkers often see natural law as part of God's design for the universe and humanity. However, secular defenders of natural law, such as John Locke and John Finnis, argue that moral principles can be grounded in human nature and reason without the need for divine authority. At the same time, atheistic and secular critics challenge the very existence of an inherent moral order, arguing that morality is a human construct shaped by cultural, historical, and social forces. This divide over natural law reflects deeper philosophical disagreements about the nature of morality and its relationship to human nature, reason, and the divine.

VIII. Exceptions and Overlaps

While belief in God often correlates with support for natural law theory, and secular critiques tend to challenge its foundation, there are notable exceptions and overlaps in this general pattern. Some religious thinkers, particularly within certain branches of Protestantism, reject natural law despite their belief in God. On the other hand, some non-theists support natural law principles, grounding them in rational or humanistic considerations rather than in divine authority. These exceptions reveal the complexity of the natural law debate, as it cuts across the lines of religious belief and secular philosophy, and highlights the diverse ways in which thinkers from different backgrounds engage with the idea of universal moral principles.

A. Religious Critics of Natural Law

While natural law theory has deep roots in Christian theology, particularly in the works of Thomas Aquinas and the Catholic tradition, it has faced substantial criticism from some religious thinkers, especially within Protestantism. These critics argue that natural law places too much emphasis on human reason and does not sufficiently account for the fallen nature of humanity or the need for divine revelation. For them, morality is fully dependent on God's will as revealed in Scripture, and any attempt to discern moral truths through human reason is seen as flawed.

1. Protestant Rejection of Natural Law: Karl Barth and Neo-Orthodoxy

One of the most prominent religious critics of natural law was Karl Barth, a leading figure in 20th-century Protestant theology and the founder of neo-orthodoxy. Barth's rejection of natural law is deeply tied to his emphasis on the fallenness of human nature and the centrality of divine revelation in understanding moral truth.

- Barth's Critique of Human Reason: For Barth, natural law represents an overconfidence in human reason's ability to discern moral truths. He argued that, due to the fall, human beings are incapable of knowing God's will or understanding moral principles without direct revelation from God. In his view, the idea that humans can reason their way to an objective moral order is an affront to the sovereignty of God and underestimates the

depth of human sinfulness. Barth believed that only through God's Word, as revealed in Scripture and the person of Jesus Christ, can human beings know what is right and wrong. Natural law, by contrast, elevates human reason to a position that competes with or bypasses divine authority.

- Revelation as the Source of Morality: Barth's rejection of natural law is part of his broader theological framework, in which he stresses that morality cannot be based on human experience or nature but must come directly from God's self-revelation. He viewed natural law as an attempt to discover moral truths independently of God's specific commands, which he saw as theologically dangerous. According to Barth, Scripture—not human nature or reason—provides the only reliable guide for moral action. His emphasis on the primacy of revelation over natural law has influenced many Protestant traditions, particularly those that emphasize the fallen nature of humanity and the sufficiency of Scripture.

2. Reformation-Era Skepticism About Natural Law

The Protestant Reformation of the 16th century brought about a major shift in Christian thought regarding the role of reason and natural law. Many Reformers, such as Martin Luther and John Calvin, were skeptical of the idea that human beings could discern moral truths through reason alone, without relying on the specific commands of Scripture.

- Martin Luther's View of Human Reason: Martin Luther was highly critical of the notion that human reason could lead to moral or theological truth. He viewed reason as deeply corrupted by sin and incapable of leading individuals to true knowledge of God or morality. Luther argued that humans are utterly dependent on God's grace and revelation for their salvation and understanding of right and wrong. For him, natural law was too optimistic about human reason's capacity and failed to recognize the devastating effects of the fall. Luther's rejection of natural law was part of his larger theological emphasis on justification by faith alone and the sufficiency of Scripture as the only source of moral guidance.
- John Calvin and the Doctrine of Total Depravity: John Calvin, another major Reformer, shared Luther's skepticism of natural law, though he acknowledged that human beings have a basic sense of right and wrong

through conscience. However, Calvin's doctrine of total depravity—the idea that every aspect of human nature has been corrupted by sin—led him to conclude that human reason is not reliable for discerning moral truths. Like Barth, Calvin argued that morality must be grounded in the Word of God, rather than in human nature or reason. He believed that while humans may have some natural awareness of moral laws, this awareness is clouded and distorted by sin, making divine revelation essential for true moral knowledge.

- Protestant Emphasis on Sola Scriptura: The rejection of natural law in Protestant theology is closely linked to the doctrine of sola scriptura, the belief that Scripture alone is the ultimate authority in matters of faith and practice. Many Protestants argue that reliance on natural law undermines the sufficiency of Scripture by suggesting that humans can arrive at moral truths through reason alone. This emphasis on Scripture as the exclusive source of moral knowledge has led many Protestant theologians to be wary of natural law, viewing it as a dangerous reliance on human wisdom rather than divine revelation.

B. Non-Theists Supporting Natural Law

While natural law theory has traditionally been associated with religious thinkers, there are also cases of secular or non-religious thinkers who accept natural law principles on rational or humanistic grounds. These secular defenders of natural law argue that moral principles can be derived from an understanding of human nature, rationality, or the structure of the world, without requiring belief in a divine lawgiver. For them, natural law provides a framework for objective moral truths that are accessible to all people, regardless of their religious beliefs.

1. Human Nature as the Basis for Secular Natural Law

Secular defenders of natural law often argue that moral principles can be grounded in an understanding of human nature and the basic goods that are essential for human flourishing. By reflecting on what it means to be human and what contributes to well-being, they claim that objective moral principles can be discerned through rational inquiry, without the need for religious belief.

- John Locke and Natural Rights: John Locke is perhaps the most famous example of a secular thinker who defended natural law principles. Locke argued that all human beings, by virtue of their nature, possess natural rights to life, liberty, and property. While Locke was personally a Christian, his theory of natural rights does not depend on religious belief. Instead, it is grounded in the rational recognition of the dignity and autonomy of all human beings. Locke's natural law theory became the foundation for modern human rights discourse, showing that natural law principles can be defended in a secular framework.
- John Finnis and the Basic Goods: A more contemporary example of a secular natural law theorist is John Finnis, who has developed a theory of natural law based on the idea of basic goods that are intrinsic to human well-being. Finnis identifies a set of goods—such as life, knowledge, play, and friendship—that are universally valuable and can be known through rational reflection on the human condition. For Finnis, these basic goods provide the foundation for moral principles that apply to all people, regardless of their religious beliefs. His work demonstrates that natural law can be grounded in a rational understanding of human flourishing, without appealing to divine authority.

2. Moral Objectivity Without God

One of the key arguments of secular defenders of natural law is that moral objectivity does not require belief in God. They argue that human beings, by virtue of their rational capacities, can discover universal moral truths that are grounded in human nature or the structure of the world. These truths are objective in the sense that they apply to all human beings, regardless of their personal preferences or cultural background.

- Immanuel Kant and the Categorical Imperative: While Immanuel Kant is not typically classified as a natural law theorist, his theory of the categorical imperative shares important elements with natural law. Kant argued that moral principles must be universalizable and based on reason, rather than contingent on particular circumstances or divine commands. His emphasis on rational moral duties reflects the natural law idea that morality can be discovered through human reason. Kant's work shows that it is possible to

defend objective moral principles without appealing to God, relying instead on the rational capacities shared by all human beings.

- Humanistic Ethics and the Common Good: Some secular thinkers have developed natural law theories based on a humanistic understanding of morality. They argue that moral principles should be grounded in the common good and the well-being of all individuals. By reflecting on what is necessary for human flourishing—such as respect for human rights, freedom, and justice—they argue that natural law principles can be derived without invoking religious beliefs. This approach provides a way for non-religious individuals to engage with the idea of universal morality, while rejecting the need for a divine lawgiver.

In summary, the relationship between belief in God and support for natural law is not as straightforward as it might initially appear. While many religious thinkers, particularly within Catholicism, support natural law as part of God's design, some Protestant theologians, such as Karl Barth, reject natural law on the grounds that human reason is too corrupt to discern moral truths without divine revelation. At the same time, there are non-religious thinkers who defend natural law principles, grounding them in rational reflection on human nature or the common good, without appealing to God. These exceptions and overlaps reveal the complexity of the natural law debate, as it cuts across both religious and secular lines, and highlights the diverse ways in which thinkers from different backgrounds engage with the idea of universal moral principles.

IX. Conclusion

Summary of the Divide

The debate over natural law theory reveals a profound philosophical and theological divide that centers on differing views of morality, human nature, and the role of divine authority. On one side, proponents of natural law—especially those who are religious—tend to see moral principles as inherent in the fabric of reality, grounded either in God's will or in the rational order of creation. For these thinkers, belief in a divine creator who instills an objective moral order into the

universe provides a firm foundation for natural law. The enduring influence of figures like Thomas Aquinas highlights how natural law has been historically tied to the Christian understanding of morality as a reflection of God's eternal law. However, natural law's defenders are not limited to the religious sphere. Secular philosophers such as John Locke and John Finnis have advanced natural law theory by grounding moral principles in human nature and reason, showing that natural law can be embraced without appealing to God.

Conversely, critics of natural law, particularly those from the legal positivist, utilitarian, and existentialist camps, reject the notion of an objective moral order, whether divine or natural. Legal positivists like H.L.A. Hart argue that law is a human creation, separate from any inherent moral truths. Utilitarians, such as Jeremy Bentham, challenge natural law by emphasizing that morality should be based on the consequences of actions rather than on absolute principles derived from nature. Existentialists, like Jean-Paul Sartre, reject the idea that morality can be grounded in any fixed human nature, arguing instead that moral values are created through individual freedom and choice. These critics challenge the fundamental assumptions of natural law by questioning whether there is any universal or inherent moral order at all, suggesting instead that morality is either socially constructed, subjective, or contingent on human experience.

Final Thoughts

The enduring debate over natural law theory reflects deeper questions about the nature of morality, the limits of human reason, and the existence of God. At its core, the acceptance or rejection of natural law theory hinges on one's worldview—whether one believes in a divine order that grounds morality or sees morality as a product of human rationality or social construct.

For religious proponents of natural law, especially within Christianity, the theory offers a way to harmonize faith and reason, showing that God's moral law is not arbitrary but is embedded in the very nature of the universe. Natural law serves as a bridge that connects theological ethics with philosophical reasoning, providing a universal framework for engaging in moral discourse that transcends cultural and religious differences. This view appeals to those who seek a stable foundation for moral truths, one that is not dependent on changing social norms or subjective preferences.

However, as secular societies have evolved, the natural law framework has been both adapted and contested. Secular defenders, like Finnis, have stripped away the religious underpinnings of natural law while maintaining its essential claim: that there are objective moral goods that contribute to human flourishing and can be known through reason. This secularization of natural law has allowed it to remain relevant in human rights discourse and legal theory, even as societies become more pluralistic and less reliant on religious justifications for law.

On the other hand, natural law theory faces significant opposition from those who view morality as contingent, relative, or subjective. The challenges posed by legal positivism, moral relativism, and existentialism highlight the difficulty of defending a universal moral order in a world marked by cultural diversity, differing moral beliefs, and skepticism about the existence of an inherent human nature. For these critics, natural law is overly idealistic, assuming a coherence and rationality to the moral order that does not align with the complexities of human life.

Ultimately, the debate over natural law raises fundamental questions about how we know what is right or wrong, whether human reason can discern moral truths, and whether morality is fixed or malleable. While natural law remains a powerful and influential theory—particularly in legal philosophy and human rights—it also reveals the deep tensions between religious and secular worldviews. These tensions will likely persist as societies continue to grapple with questions of moral authority, human nature, and the place of religion in public life.

In conclusion, the acceptance or rejection of natural law theory is deeply intertwined with larger questions about the purpose of human life, the role of reason, and the existence of objective moral truths. Whether grounded in divine law or human nature, natural law continues to be a contested but enduring framework in the search for a moral foundation that transcends time, culture, and belief.

References

Aquinas, T. (2006). *Summa Theologica*. (Fathers of the English Dominican Province, Trans.). Christian Classics Ethereal Library. (Original work published c. 1274).

Barth, K. (1936). *Church Dogmatics, Volume I: The Doctrine of the Word of God*. T&T Clark.

Bentham, J. (1789). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Clarendon Press.

Calvin, J. (1536). *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. (H. Beveridge, Trans.). Christian Classics Ethereal Library. (Original work published 1536).

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books.

Finnis, J. (1980). *Natural Law and Natural Rights*. Oxford University Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (1961). *The Concept of Law*. Clarendon Press.

Hume, D. (1739). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford University Press.

Kant, I. (1785). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785).

Locke, J. (1690). *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge University Press.

Luther, M. (1525). *The Bondage of the Will*. (J. I. Packer & O. R. Johnston, Trans.). Baker Academic. (Original work published 1525).

Nietzsche, F. (1887). *On the Genealogy of Morals*. (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). Vintage Books.

Sartre, J.-P. (1946). *Existentialism Is a Humanism*. Yale University Press.